



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/682,086	07/18/2001	Lino Iglesias	38146	7395
29569	7590	01/04/2005	EXAMINER	
JEFFREY FURR 253 N. MAIN STREET JOHNSTOWN, OH 43031			TANG, KENNETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2127	

DATE MAILED: 01/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/682,086

Applicant(s)

IGLESIAS ET AL.

Examiner

Kenneth Tang

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-4 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. In claim 1, “plurality” should be changed to “pluralities”, “mean’s” should be changed to “means”
 - b. In claim 2, “Kernel’s” should be changed to “Kernels”, “event’s” should be changed to “events”, “mean’s” should be changed to “means”, “microprocessor’s” should be changed to “microprocessors” ([c9], line 9), “containg the following fields;” ([c3], line 6) should be changed to “containing the following fields:”, “fields;” ([c10], line 2, [c12], line 3, [c14], line 2) should be changed to “fields:”, “the Parser;” ([c10], line 12) should be changed to “the Parser:”, “Allocatoin” ([c12], line 5) should be changed to “Allocation”, “the task; .” ([c14], line 3) should be changed to “the task;”, “occupies, and” ([c15], line 4) should be changed to “occupies, and”, “examined. and” ([c18], line 10) should be changed to “examined, and”
 - c. Claims 3 is objected for the same reasons as stated in the objection of claim 1 above.
 - d. Claims 4 is objected for the same reasons as stated in the objection of claim 2 above.

Appropriate correction is required. The Examiner asks that the Applicant review the claims carefully and correct all spelling and grammatical errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention:

- a. The following terms are indefinite:
 - i. In Claim 1, “Having” ([c1], line 3, [c2], lines 9, 15, 16, 20, 23, 26 and 28) is indefinite because it indicates a system claim but claim 1 is a method claim.
 - ii. In Claim 1, “dynamic chain” in [c2], line 6 is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether or not this is the same “dynamic chain” in [c1], line 10 or a new dynamic chain is being introduced. In addition, there is no relationship made of any dynamic behavior in the blocks.
 - iii. In claim 1, “kernel” ([c1], line 4) is indefinite because it is unclear in the claim language how the kernel is involved with processing or control the execution of all the task control blocks.
 - iv. In claim 1, “task control blocks” are indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether these are the same as the “Task Information Block”, “Event Control Block”, “Pipe Control Block”, “Data Memory Control Block”, etc.

- v. In Claim 1, “a chain” in [c2], line 8 is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether or not this refers to the “dynamic chain” in [c1], line 10 or a new chain is being introduced.
- vi. In Claim 1, “Task Allocation Tables” in [c2], line 17 is indefinite because there is no relationship established between these tables to the task control blocks.
- vii. In Claim 1, “subprocess” [c2], lines 24, 27, and 29 is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language which process this is a subprocess of.
- viii. In claim 1, “them” ([c2], line 26) is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language what them refers to.
- ix. In Claim 2, “Having” ([c3], line 3, [c8], line 1, [c9], line 1, [c10], line 1, [c12], line 1, [c16], lines 1, 4, and 8, [c17], line 1, [c18], and line 11 is indefinite because it indicates a system claim but claim 1 is a method claim.
- x. In claim 2, “task control blocks” are indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether these are the same as the “Task Information Block”, “Event Control Block”, “Pipe Control Block”, “Data Memory Control Block”, etc.
- xi. In claim 2, “a Pipe” ([c4], line 8 is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether or not this is the same as “the Pipe” in [c4], line 6.

xii. In claim 2, “chain” ([c4], lines 14, 15, and 17, [c7], line 13) is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether or not this term refers to the dynamic chain ([c4], line 3).

xiii. In claim 2, “Control & Status field” is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear whether this is one or two fields.

xiv. In claim 2, “a Data memory Pointer” ([c10], line 13) is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether this is the same as the Task Control Block Pointer, Event Control Block Pointer, etc., or if new additional data memory pointers are being introduced.

xv. In claim 2, “pointers” is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language whether or not this pointer is referring to the Data Memory Pointer ([c10], line 13).

xvi. In Claim 2, “subprocess” [c16], lines 1, 12, [c18], line 11 is indefinite because it is not made explicitly clear in the claim language which process this is a subprocess of.

b. The following lacks antecedent basis:

xvii. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the memory blocks" in [c2], line 18. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xviii. Claim 1 recites the limitations "the WAIT state" and “the READY state” in [c2], lines 25 and 27. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

xix. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the computer means" in [c2], line 31.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xx. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the Task Header" in [c3], line 16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xxi. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the chain" in [c3], line 26 and [c16], line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is unclear in the claim language whether or not this refers to the dynamic chain.

xxii. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the pipe" in [c4], line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xxiii. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the identifier" in [c4], line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xxiv. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the event's" in [c4], line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xxv. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the Parser" in [c10], line 12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

xxvi. Claim 2 recites the limitation "the pointer" in [c16], lines 8 and 18, [c17], line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

2. Claims 3 is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the objection of claim 1 above.
3. Claims 4 is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the objection of claim 2 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dean, Jr. et al. (hereinafter Dean) (US 4,123,795) in view of Shaw et al. (hereinafter Shaw) (US 5,745,758).

5. As to claim 1, Dean teaches a method for architecture for a multitasking operating system, the method comprising the steps of:

Having a processing Kernel (operating system) (*col. 51, lines 53-60*);

Controlling the execution of each task with a task control block with every task comprises one block and with a plurality of task control blocks (*col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-3*);

Controlling events associated with a task using a Task Information Block with every task comprising one block and with a plurality of Task Information Blocks (*col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-3*);

Controlling events associated with a task using an Event Control Block with every event comprising one block and with a plurality of Event Control Blocks (*col. 4, lines 64-67 and col. 5, lines 1-3*);

Art Unit: 2127

Controlling a task's communication pipes with a Pipe Control Block with every pipe comprising one block and with a plurality of Pipe Control Blocks (*col. 36, lines 51-66*);

Managing memory assigned to a task with a Data Memory Control Block with a plurality of Data Memory Control Blocks arranged in a chain (*col. 9, lines 56-68*);

Having Task Data Memory blocks which are data memory blocks associated with each task in which a task's Task Data Memory block stores its context on one Task Data Memory block before yielding computer means handling to the Kernel (operating system) (*col. 9, lines 56-68 and col. 49, lines 25-35*);

Using Port Information Blocks which are special memory blocks used to handle a microprocessor mean's input and output ports (*col. 12, lines 15-24*);

Having the Kernel use Kernel Control Registers which are used to store required operation data (operating system) (*col. 24, lines 33-40*);

Having a plurality of Task Allocation Tables which is a table of pointers that accurately identify the beginning of the memory blocks associated with a task (*col. 23, lines 9-21, col. 47, lines 7-15*);

Starting a task's program code section with a Task Header which provides basic information about the task (*col. 47, lines 7-15*);

Having a Port State Update control block subprocess which carries out reading and verification of a microprocessor's input ports to set up port events, which can be signaled when the state of an input port changes (*col. 22, lines 50-64, col. 37, lines 13-32*);

Art Unit: 2127

Having a Task State Update control block subprocess which carries out reading and verification of events to update the state of tasks on the WAIT state and switch them to the READY state if their expected event is signaled (*col. 22, lines 50-64, col. 18, line 29*);

Having a Priority Task Ordering subprocess which selects a task in the READY state that is to be switched to the ACTIVE state (*col. 18, line 29, col. 23, lines 9-21*); and

Having a Context and Control Restore subprocess which executes the restoration of all context variables associated with the active task (*col. 9, lines 63-68*).

6. Dean fails to explicitly teach a yielding to a parser which continues the execution of the active tasks' instructions and to have a dynamic chain of control blocks. Shaw teaches a dynamic control of information and a parser means which provides a linking for an execution call (*col. 11, lines 13-29, col. 18, lines 6-29, col. 20, lines 48-50*). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Shaw's operating system architecture features of a parser which continues the execution of the active tasks' instructions and to have a dynamic chain of control blocks to Dean's operating system architecture in order to accommodate communications, storage and retrieval as well as optimizing the operating system performance (*col. 3, lines 1-5 and 35-40*).

7. Claim 3 is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 1 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 2 and 4 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kt
12/20/04


LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER